

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: T. KOBAYASHI, et al.
Serial No: 10/574,173
Filed: November 13, 2006
Title: DECORATING MATERIAL
Group: 1794
Examiner: T. DICUS
Conf. No.: 4099

REQUEST FOR INTERVIEW AFTER FINAL REJECTION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

March 17, 2008

Sir:

The telephone communication by the undersigned with the Examiner in charge of the above-identified application, requesting an interview, is noted. During this telephone communication, the Examiner indicated that, in general, interviews are not granted in the involved art unit after final rejection, but that an interview may be granted after consideration of the issues to be considered during the interview. The Examiner requested a written agenda for the interview.

In view of the foregoing, set forth in the following is an agenda for the proposed interview, addressing each of the objections/rejections in the Final Office Action mailed December 13, 2007.

During the interview, the undersigned will refer to a description in the specification of the above-identified application of the sub-regions as recited

in claim 6, pointing out that it is not required to use, in the claims, the exact terms used in the specification.

With respect to the objection to the drawings, the undersigned initially intends to find out where the objected-to expressions (i.e., “first sub-portion”, “second portion” and “sub-portions” (emphasis added)) are in the claims; and if what is meant by the Examiner in the objection to the drawings is the recited regions/sub-regions, these will be pointed out in the drawings by the undersigned.

With respect to the various bases for the rejection under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112, the various terms will be discussed with respect to description in Applicants’ original disclosure, and it is intended to discuss with the Examiner appropriate terms to be used in the claims, for overcoming this rejection. Similarly with the rejection under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112, it is intended to discuss with the Examiner the meaning of the terms objected to by the Examiner, and to reach agreement as to appropriate terms to be used.

With respect to the prior art rejections, focus of discussion will be on the teachings of U.S. Patent No. 6,326,074 to Takahashi. Differences between the teachings of this reference and the presently claimed subject matter will be discussed, with advantages achieved due to these differences being discussed. Specifically, inter alia, the undersigned will contend that the pattern ink layer 3 according to the present invention, formed by ink having a property capable of interacting with the ionizing radiation-curable resin composition for forming the surface protective layer 5 to cause elution, dispersion and mixing therebetween, is different from, and would have neither

been disclosed nor suggested by, the ink forming the impenetrable layer 5 of Takahashi.

As previously set forth herein, the Examiner indicated that upon review of the Agenda the Examiner would indicate to the undersigned as to whether the interview would be granted. As the Examiner has requested that this agenda for the interview be set forth in writing, the undersigned respectfully requests that a response to this request be set forth in writing.

Please charge any shortage in the fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (Case No. 511.42180X00) and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

/William I. Solomon/

William I. Solomon

Registration No. 28,565

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP

WIS/kmh

Attachments